

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Office States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
06/13/2005	L Julie Huber	13407-026US1	5992
10/04/2006		EXAMINER	
RDSON PC		LEE, JAE W	
NOI 55440 1000		ADTIBUT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			PAPER NUMBER
	10/04/2006 RDSON PC	10/04/2006 RDSON PC	06/13/2005 L Julie Huber 13407-026US1 10/04/2006 EXAM RDSON PC LEE, J.

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summant	10/538,823	HUBER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Jae W. Lee	1656		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence ac	idress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 136(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT e, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed (HS from the mailing date of this of ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
<u> </u>	—· s action is non-final.			
•—	owance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under		· ·		
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application	1.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	cepted or b) objected to b	y the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	=:		, ,	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form P	TO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 		119(a)-(d) or (f).		
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority document		onlication No		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	·	Stage	
application from the International Burea				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not r	received.		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		/Mail Date formal Patent Application		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	• •		

Application/Control Number: 10/538,823

Art Unit: 1656

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-11, drawn to a method of evaluating a compound.

Group II, claim(s) 12, drawn to a method of evaluating a protein comprising determining whether the alteration has an effect on the interaction, of the polypeptide with a cytochrome c polypeptide, or on the deacetylation of cytochrome c.

Group III, claim(s) 13, drawn to a method of evaluating a protein comprising identifying one or more polymorphisms in a gene that encodes the candidate protein.

Group IV, claim(s) 14-16, drawn to a method of comprising evaluating the compound for its ability to modulate acetylation in the cell.

Group V, claim(s) 17-21, drawn to a method of modulating cell growth in an animal comprising modulating the acetylation of a cytochrome c in the animal.

The inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical

Art Unit: 1656

features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. The technical feature that is shared among the Applicants' Groups of inventions drawn to different methods is a polypeptide having acetylation or deacetylation activity. Applicants use the technical feature in different methods of evaluating a compound, a protein, or in a method of modulating cell growth. Frye teaches human SIRT1, SIRT2, SIRT3, and many polypeptides having acetylation or deacetylation activity (R.A. Frye, Phylogenetic classification of prokaryotic and eukaryotic Sir2-like proteins. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 273 (2000), pp. 793–798, See attached reference). Therefore, the shared technical feature of the Groups is not a "special technical feature", and unity of invention between the Groups does not exist.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

SIRT1, SIRT2, and SIRT3

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims

Application/Control Number: 10/538,823

Art Unit: 1656

subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Claims 1-11 correspond to the species listed above wherein each method is directed to acetylation or deacetylation activities by a polypeptide, wherein the said polypeptide can be SIRT1, SIRT2, or SIRT3.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1-11.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Each of the species, SIRT1, SIRT2, or SIRT3, is considered as a single inventive concept because each polypeptide is comprised of amino acids that fold into a different three-dimensional structure having different mode of operation, different function, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01).

Conclusion

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jae W. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-9949. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr can be reached on 571-272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 1656

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patent Examiner: Jae W. Lee, Ph.D.

RICHARD HUTSON, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER